DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 043 299 HE 001 769

TITLE	Preliminary Report on the Status of Women at Harvard.
INSTITUTION	Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass.
PUB DATE	9 Mar 70
NOTE	16p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.90
DESCRIPTORS	Discriminatory Attitudes (Social), *Employment Patterns, Employment Practices, *Faculty Promotion, Faculty Recruitment, Females, *Feminism, Graduate Students, *Higher Education, Promotion (Occupational), *Women Professors

ABSTRACT

Section I of this report on the status of women at Harvard discusses the inclusion of women in the faculty, administration, and Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. Women are underrepresented at the highest and most visible levels of the faculty. Though women constitute roughly 20 percent of the students taught in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, women hold only 13.5 percent of the selected teaching and research appointments and their appointments are concentrated at the lower levels. Of Harvard's 447 administrative employees, 111 are women, but only 8.1 percent of these are in the highest ranks, as opposed to 28.4 percent of the male administrative employees. In the GSAS approximately the same percentage of female applicants is accepted as male applicants. The second section discusses the reasons for reviewing the whole situation, and the third section suggests the formation and composition of a committee of the Faculty to study the status of women in the Faculty, the Graduate School, and the Administration. This section also raises policy question s that the committee should consider in terms of faculty recruitment and appointment, administrative hiring, and promotion practices, and admission policies, awarding of fellowships and teaching assistantships, and job recommendations in the Graduate School. The appendix includes a report on female attrition rates in the Graduate School, and one on part-time professorial appointments at Princeton. (AF)

ED043299

PRELIMINARY REPORT ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN AT HARVARD

From: The Women's Faculty Group

Date: March 9, 1970

Our purpose in this memo is, first, to propose the creation of a committee of the Faculty to study the status of women at Harvard and, second, to formulate questions that such a committee might study. Section I describes the participation of women in the Faculty, the Administration, and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. Section II summarizes reasons for reviewing this situation. Section III suggests the composition of the proposed faculty committee and enumerates the policy questions to be raised.

I. Participation of Women in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences

A. Faculty

Women are underrepresented at the highest and most visible levels of the Faculty, at least in comparison with their representation in the student body. Women constitute roughly 20 percent of the graduate and of the undergraduate students taught under the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. Table I shows the numbers of women holding selected teaching and research appointments during the academic year 1969 - 70. Although women occupy 13.5 percent of the positions covered in Table I, their appointments are concentrated at the lower levels -- in Teaching Fellowships, in Lectureships, and in research.

HE001 769

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

TABLE I

WOMEN IN SELECTED CORPORATION APPOINTMENTS

UNDER THE FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES*

1969-70

Title	Total	Women	Percent Women
Regular Faculty			
Full Professors	444	0	0.0
Associate Professors	39	0	0.0
Assistant Professors	194	9	4.6
Instructors	18	3	16.7
Teaching Fellows	1104	226	20.5
Other Faculty			
Lecturers	233	36	15.5
Research			
Senior Research Associates	3	1	33.3
Research Associates	63	11	17.5
Research Fellows	397	51	12.9
TOTALS	2495	337	13.5

*Students in GSAS as of October 1, 1969: Men 2480, Women 600.

Beginning on July 1, 1970, one woman Full Professor will hold the Zemurray-Stone Radcliffe Professorship, established specifically for women. There are two Professors emeritae, one of whom is a former incumbent of the Zemurray-Stone chair.

The high percentage of women Lecturers requires comment. Our interviews of 26 of the 36 female Lecturers revealed that the Lecturer category includes the part-time teaching appointments of administrative officers of Radcliffe and of research appointees as well as full- and part-time tutorial leaders and language teachers. Of the 26 Lecturers interviewed, 13 are full-time teachers. Most of these teach foreign languages and carry exceptionally heavy course loads. Nine of the female Lecturers hold administrative

or research posts. The Lectureship is, for men as well as women, an exceptional appointment, outside the "real" system.

The high percentage of female Research Associates and Fellows is also significant. Like the Lectureship, these positions are outside the "real" system. Such research appointments may be valuable professional experience when used for a one-, two-, or three-year period of post-doctoral training. A problem arises, however, when limited appointments become career positions for lack of alternative possibilities. The fact that the percentage of women holding these positions rises as the categories become more senior (women are 12.9 percent of Research Fellows, 17.5 percent of Research Associates, 33.3 percent of Senior Research Associates) suggests that women are more likely to become career research personnel than men.

Table I pertains to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences only. Appendix I cites comparative statistics for Harvard University as a whole for 1959-60 and 1968-69. In other parts of the University, in contrast to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, women hold a small number (10) of Associate and Full Professorships. Appendix I also shows that in the University as a whole the percentage of faculty positions (Instructorships and Assistant, Associate, and Full Professorships) held by women declined slightly between 1959-60, when it was 5.06 percent, and 1968-69, when it was 4.68 percent.

B. Administration

There are four problems that concern women who hold Corporation Appointments in the Administration at Harvard.

1. Although 111 of Harvard's 447 administrative employees with Corporation Appointments are women, only nine, or 8.1 percent, of the women are in the highest ranks (Deans, Associate Deans, Assistant Deans, Directors, Associate Directors, Assistant Directors). Of 336 male administrative employees, 96, or 28.4 percent, are in the highest ranks.

2. There are no women Assistant Directors (see Table II below). Women holding this position (roughly defined as assisting the Director and having one or more secretaries under her) are given lesser titles such as Administrative Assistant.

3. A greater percentage of male than of female administrators are eligible to attend faculty meetings. In certain senior categories, there are no women who are eligible to attend. Except in special cases (e.g., University Librarian), the right to attend does not seem to be granted because of title. For example, 25 male Directors may attend faculty meetings although only nine are Lecturers; two female Directors are also Lecturers but only one is eligible to attend. The line of separation seems to be one of sex (see Table II).

TABLE II

ADMINISTRATORS ELIGIBLE TO ATTEND FACULTY MEETINGS

1969-70*

	Men			Women		
Title	No.	Also Lecturer	Eligible to Attend	No.	Also Lecturer	Eligible to Attend
Director	45	9	25	4	2	1
Associate Director	16	5	5	1	1	0
Assistant Director	18	1	1	0	0	0

*Figures as of Fall 1969. Source: Directory of Officers and Students.

4. A general impression exists among women that they are paid less than men at the same administrative level. It may be that this results in part from the fact that they have accepted titles that disparage their responsibilities. But the feeling persists even where the titles are equivalent. This is not the place to prove or disprove this allegation; perhaps it is enough to say that the impression is so widespread that it should either be proved or disproved.

C. Graduate School of Arts and Sciences

The percentage of women graduate students has increased slightly over the past ten years. Moreover, there seems to have been an increase in the number of women receiving scholarships and Teaching Fellowships.

TABLE III

HARVARD GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

	1959-60				1968-69			
	No. Men	No. Women (Radcliffe)	Total	Percent Women	No. Men	No. Women	Total	Percent Women
Applications	2818	872	3690	23.6	4653	1679	6332	26.5
Admitted	1267	365	1632	22.3	1408	460	1868	24.6
Registered (new students)	685	174	859	20.3	597	226	823	27.5
Registered (all resident students)	1749	394	2143	18.4	2237	653	2890	22.6
Holders of scholarships*	597	143	740	19.3	756	219	975	22.5
Holders of Teaching Fellowships	486	69	555	12.4	898	213	1111	19.2
Total receiving Ph.D.	303	32	335	9.6	372	87	459	19.0

*These figures exclude staff tuition scholarships and outside fellowships, governmental and non-governmental.

The percentage of applicants accepted is similar for men and women. In 1968-69, 29.7 percent of men applicants were accepted, and 26.7 percent of women applicants. In

1967-68, 26.6 percent of men applicants were accepted and 26.9 percent of women applicants. This situation has been described approvingly by the Dean of the Graduate School as an "equitable harmony"(Dean's Report on the GSAS, 1967-68, p. 5). Given, however, the comparatively smaller numbers of women applying to the Graduate School, one might ask whether accepting equal percentages of men and women actually constitutes equal treatment. If women applicants are a more highly pre-selected group, they may be a more able and more highly motivated group. Equal treatment of such a group would result in the acceptance of a higher percentage of them.

Conventional wisdom holds that "the drop-out rate is markedly greater for female students than for males" (Report of the Committee on the Future of the Graduate School, March 1969, p. 5) and that female students progress toward the Ph.D. at a slower rate than their male counterparts (Dean's Report on GSAS, 1964-65, p. 2). It seems clear, however, not only that the reasons for these phenomena have not been examined by the University in recent years, either in the Wolff report on the Graduate School or in other studies, but also that the phenomena themselves are insufficiently documented. Dr. Humphrey Doermann's study "Baccalaureate Origins and the Performance of Students in the Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences" contains an appendix that seems to be the only study in recent years documenting the female attrition rate (see Appendix II). But the Doermann report does not prove that women are currently dropping out at a greater rate than men, or that, in the past, they dropped out at a greater rate if given equal scholarship opportunities.

II. Reasons for Reviewing the Situation

Many explanations might be given for the lack of female participation described in the preceding section: overt discrimination, stereotyped conceptions of the woman's role held by both men and women, sociological and psychological factors. But, whatever the causes, a change in the situation would benefit the Harvard community.

A woman who has successfully earned a graduate degree has demonstrated sufficient professional commitment to warrant consideration for employment on equal terms with men. Moreover, women faculty members and administrators, both as professionally trained scholars and as women, have worthwhile contributions to make to the University.

The scarcity of outstanding women scholars in the senior ranks at Harvard tends to discourage the professional aspirations of women students and junior faculty. Graduate women are in fact being trained professionally in an institution that barely recognizes members of their sex as professionals. At present women are regarded as exceptional in the Faculty, not as a normal and permanent component of the Harvard scene. The fact that women do not reach the highest positions in the Administration contributes further to the impression that at Harvard women cannot expect to attain rewards commensurate with their abilities and training. The scarcity of women at all levels deprives students and faculty of both sexes of the intellectual stimulation that comes with a more heterogeneous community.

It cannot be to Harvard's advantage to have women virtually excluded from policy-making, especially in a de facto coeducational institution. The University has begun to recognize that it is appropriate to have people participating in the decisions that affect them; as a result, students have been appointed to a number of committees. Women have been consulted by faculty committees as expert witnesses on the problems of women; they should now take a more active and visible role in committees and other policy-making bodies.

In the past few years, the economic and social status of women has been changing. Attitudes and practices in industry, in government, and in the community at large are being challenged and reevaluated; as a result, women are beginning to have greater areas of choice and increased opportunities to contribute to the world outside the home. Harvard should not lag behind in an important area of social change.

III. Composition of the Committee and Policy Questions to be Raised

We propose that a committee of the Faculty be formed to study the status of women in the Faculty, the Graduate School and the Administration. We suggest that the committee be composed of the following:

2 female faculty members
2 male faculty members
1 female Research Associate or Fellow
2 administrators (1 male, 1 female)
1 female graduate student
1 Radcliffe undergraduate
1 Harvard undergraduate

The following sections raise policy questions that the committee should consider.

A. Faculty

We recognize that any attempt to increase the participation of women in the Faculty is necessarily limited by the absolute size of the pool of qualified candidates from which to draw. It may be, however, (1.) that our mechanisms of recruitment, established many years ago for the recruitment of male academics, prevent us from identifying all possible members of that pool; (2.) that stereotyped opinions of the female role prevent us from recognizing that changing career/family patterns now make it possible for more women to engage in full-time academic careers; (3,) that institutional changes such as part-time appointments would further increase the number of qualified women who could pursue academic careers.

The committee should therefore ask the following questions:

...Do departmental search, recruitment and promotion policies give adequate attention to female candidates?
...Are the present criteria for hiring and promoting men and women the same? Should these criteria be the same?
...How are qualified women to be recruited and retained, especially at the higher levels?

...Do hiring and search committees take the marital and family status of women into account in making job offers and recommendations for promotion? Should the marital/family status of a woman be a consideration in hiring and promotion?
...Should academic positions be made more flexible for both men and women with respect to age guidelines and part-time employment?
...Should the University establish or support day-care centers for the children of faculty and employees?

The problem of recruitment requires additional comment. It may be that search committees which fill senior faculty positions fail to seek distinguished women candidates. It also seems likely that conventional opinions about the incompatibility of family responsibilities and an academic career are applied rigidly and inappropriately by search and hiring committees, and that talented and qualified women are thus needlessly eliminated from job consideration. Some female graduate students and academics feel that job interviewers, here and elsewhere, overreach themselves in inquiring about a woman's plans for a family, her husband's job future, and so on.

The question of part-time appointments also requires comment. Some members of the Harvard community have expressed a desire to see the academic structure made more flexible for both sexes, because of the needs of some female academics and because of changing male career patterns. There seems to be a need to regularize and institutionalize the flexibility that now exists in the form of ad hoc and exceptional amendments to the regular structure, notably the Lectureship, while avoiding the second-class status of the present part-time appointments. It must be emphasized, however, that women should not be assigned automatically to part-time positions.*

* For a recent decision by Princeton concerning part-time professorial appointments, see Appendix III.

B. Administration

In contrast to the situation in the Faculty, there are large numbers of women in the Administration. Although the great majority of these women are concentrated in the lower ranks, a number of them seem to be performing work comparable to that of male administrators at higher ranks.

The committee should therefore ask the following questions:

...Is sex a factor in the hiring, promotion, or salary scale of administrators?
...What criteria determine whether an administrator is eligible to attend faculty meetings? Is sex a factor?

C. Graduate School of Arts and Sciences

Women are a minority of the graduate students enrolled at Harvard. Moreover, female graduate students feel that, because of their sex, every stage of graduate education is more difficult for them: admission to graduate school, competition for financial aid and Teaching Fellowships, and especially job placement. Women students experience what has been called a "climate of unexpectation": fear of discrimination, awareness of their real difficulties in working out career patterns, and the assumption on the part of some faculty members that "women don't pan out."

The committee should therefore address itself to the following groups of questions:

(1.) ...Are women admitted to the Graduate School on equal terms with men? Should "equal terms" be defined as equal percentages?
...Do admissions policies regarding women vary by department?
...Do admissions committees consider marital status and family plans when assessing female candidates?

(2.) ...Are women discriminated against in the awarding of financial aid, Teaching Fellowships, and post-doctoral grants? Are married women discriminated against more than single women?
...Are female Teaching Fellows discriminated against in appointments as non-resident or resident Tutors in the Houses?
...Should the possibilities for part-time graduate work be increased for both men and women?
...What sort of advisory facilities are available for graduate women? Should these facilities be improved?
...Has the University made adequate provision for low-cost housing for graduate women?

(3.) ...Do departmental advisors use the sex of candidates as an eliminating factor in recommending students for interviews or for jobs?
...How can departments help students to counter discrimination they face on the national job market?
...Are there channels within Harvard departments for female job candidates to register complaints if they feel that they are encountering prejudice?

Appendix I: Harvard University Officers, 1959-60 and 1968-69

Title	1959-60 Total	Male	Female	% Female of Total	1968-69 Total	Male	Female	% Female of Total
Corporation	7	7	0	0	5	5	0	0
Board of Overseers	32	32	0	0	30	30	0	0
Officers of Instruction								
University Professors	5	5	0	0	5	5	0	0
Professors	424	420	4	.94	580	577	3	.5
Associate Professors	126	118	8	6.3	151	143	8	5.3
Assistant Professors	207	199	8	3.9	401	384	17	4.2
Research Professors and Assistant Research Professors	2	2	0	0	3	3	0	0
Clinical Professors, Associate and Assistant Clinical Professors, and Clinical Associates	236	228	8	3.4	357	340	17	4.8
President and Professors Emeriti	157	155	2	1.3	184	175	9	4.9
Lecturers	224	196	28	12.5	406	356	50	12.3
Visiting Professors and Associate Professors, Visiting Lecturers, and Visiting Associates, Consultants, Critics and Fellows	107	104	3	2.8	158	149	9	5.7
Associates	117	112	5	4.3	235	211	24	10.2
Instructors	571	519	52	9.1	791	722	69	8.7
Tutors	57	56	1	1.6	75	71	4	5.3
Teaching Fellows	673	597	76	11.3	1296	1091	205	15.8
Research Associates, Research Fellows and Assistants, and Members of Research Staffs	876	796	107	12.2	1530	1286	244	15.9
Assistants	332	288	44	13.3	385	317	68	17.7
Miscellaneous Academic Appointees	232	221	11	4.7	371	326	45	12.1
Officers of Administration								
Deans, Executive Officers, Syndics and Masters	141	123	18	12.8	167	126	41	24.6
Directors, Library Officers and Curators	298	230	68	22.8	469	327	142	30.3
Health Services	84	79	5	6.0	137	126	11	8.0
Athletic Administration and Coaches	32	32	0	0	33	33	0	0
Proctors and Freshman Advisers	166	166	0	0	98	96	2	2.0
Board of Preachers	7	7	0	0	6	6	0	0
Business Officers	31	30	1	3.2	91	79	12	13.2
Miscellaneous Administrative Appointees	13	8	5	38.5	103	83	20	19.4
Radcliffe Trustees and Administrative Appointees	---		---		118	30	88	74.6

Appendix II

The Doermann report "Baccalaureate Origins and the Performance of Students in the Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences" documents the female attrition rate as follows:

> In 1962, women comprised 25% of the entering student group which enrolled for the first time in the Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences; in 1967 women comprised 26% of the entering group of students. Women comprised about 13% of the Ph.D. recipients in 1965 and 1966 combined. Taken alone, this information might seem to suggest that the general endurance and quality of women's performance in doctoral study is weaker for women than for men [sic]. However, if one examines the performance of the women who did complete the Ph.D. in 1965 and 1966, it appears that the number of registered semesters taken to complete the degree is not significantly different than for male degree recipients, and that in the Natural Sciences and Social Sciences a slightly larger proportion of women graduates completed their work in ten semesters or less (and also in 14 semesters or less) than did the men. Also, women who were married when they received the degree in all three areas tended to have completed the degree slightly more rapidly than had women who were unmarried at the time of completion. (Doermann Report, Appendix A)

But, as Dr. Doermann points out, "the actual performance which generated the results for the 1965 and 1966 Ph.D. recipients occurred 5 to 10 years ago," and "the patterns may have changed since then." He also points out that "the number of Ph.D.'s awarded to women has shown a higher percentage increase in each of the 3 major areas [Natural Sciences, Social Sciences and Humanities] than for men between 1955-and-1956 and 1965-and-1966."

A fuller study of the question, based on statistics and individual case studies, is clearly needed. But the following caveats must be borne in mind. (1.) If it is true that women work at a slower rate or have special financial difficulties or tend to move away from Boston, a study of female drop-outs is more difficult, because the very definition of "drop-out" becomes problematic. A number of female graduate students

discontinue registration in the Graduate School, frequently because their husbands move away, but continue to work on their theses. They then receive the Ph.D. several years after the records show them as having "dropped-out." (2.) A comparison of the male and female attrition rates is meaningful only if women are actually competing on equal terms with men for scholarship funds and Teaching Fellowships. (3.) The significance for the academic profession of female attrition may be different from the significance of male attrition. A male who "drops-out" presumably moves to another profession; a female who "drops-out" may be more likely to return at a later date either to graduate school (not necessarily Harvard) or to a job, such as secondary school or junior college teaching, that uses her original professional training. (4.) As long as highly trained women experience difficulty in gaining employment commensurate with their skills, women will face pressures for dropping-out greater than those faced by men. Consequently, statistical evidence on attrition will be a dangerous basis for any arguments about the relative motivation of men and women.

Appendix III

Part-Time Professorial Appointments at Princeton

The Dean of the Faculty of Princeton University sent the following memorandum to departmental chairmen on February 20, 1970:

For some time Princeton University has had a limited number of professors and associate professors on part-time appointment -- two-thirds, one-half time, or less. Those on part-time appointment have wished less than full-time duty for such reasons as special research or writing, other professional activities, or particular personal pursuits. Occasionally, professor [sic] as they approach retirement prefer less than full-time during a period of transition to emeritus status.

It now appears to be advantageous to consider part time appointments in the professorial ranks on a somewhat more regular, though still limited, basis. Part-time appointments will be permitted both for personal reasons and as a means of building distinction and strength in ways that may not be possible on a full-time basis. It may be of advantage to the University to make a part-time appointment because of a priority need in a specialized area that does not require a full-time person, or because a person of considerable distinction is only available on a part-time basis, or because two persons on half-time would bring more strength and distinction to the department than a single full-time appointment. Another important advantage of part-time appointments is they [sic] may facilitate the appointment of more women scholars to the princeton Faculty.

This matter has been discussed with the Committee on Appointments and Advancements. The Committee, generally speaking, sees no objection to a larger number of new part-time appointments or to internal shifts to a part-time basis within the professorial ranks. This does not mean, however, that we anticipate situations in which more than a small proportion of the total membership of any department would be appointed on a part-time basis. Thus, all proposals for part-time appointments will be evaluated on the basis of number of

full time and part-time faculty members in the department as well as in terms of circumstances of the individual in question. Similarly, proposals to shift from part-time to full-time service must be viewed in the light of individual circumstances and the departmental situation.

For persons on continuing tenure a voluntary shift to a part-time basis presents no special problems of Faculty rights and privileges. At the assistant professor level, part-time employment would seem to require no adjustment in the rule that requires notification by December 1st of their sixth year whether or not the department intends to recommend promotion to associate professor. In cases where scholarly prog ess is interrupted by pregnancy and maternity some special modification of this six-year rule should perhaps be made. This matter is now being studied.

Part-time appointments may also raise complications with respect to eligibility for leave. In the tenure ranks, such appointments have been handled in the past on an ad hoc basis, apparently with satisfaction. At the assistant professor level, the equivalent of 1-in-6 could be worked out in departments where that policy applies by dealing in terms of full-time equivalents.